

**REMARKS**

The Examiner has rejected independent claims 1, 3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 20 through 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102. Furthermore, the Examiner has rejected dependent claims 2, 5 through 9, 13 and 16 through 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103. The Examiner has responded to Applicant's arguments of December 23, 2005 by indicating that they are not persuasive. In view of the above claim amendment and the following remarks, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the pending rejections.

**The Section 102 Rejections**

The Examiner has rejected independent claims 1, 3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 20 through 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by the Krishnaswamy et al. reference. The Examiner has pointed out in Paragraph 2 of the currently pending Office Action that the Krishnaswamy et al. reference allegedly discloses in column 108 "a new user profile method being created." In addition, the Examiner has pointed out that the Krishnaswamy et al. reference allegedly discloses in column 183 "a list [that] is defined based upon the type of list being created." The Examiner has concluded that a new user profile "serves the function of a new address definition being generated." Similarly, the Examiner additionally concluded that the "defined list serves the function of a rule definition." Based upon the above characterization, the Examiner has sustained the previous rejection bases under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Newly amended independent claims 1, 21 and 22 now each explicitly recite "automatically generating a new address definition based upon the corresponding predetermined rule definition at the second device...." Similarly, independent claim 12 also explicitly recites "said second device ... automatically generating a new address definition based upon the corresponding predetermined rule definition ...." In other words, a new address is automatically generated according to a predetermined rule rather

than being placed by a user. Furthermore, the predetermined rule definition is “to generate a new address” in each of the newly amended independent claims.

The Krishnaswamy et al. reference generally discloses systems and methods of routing and managing telephone calls, data and other multimedia information including audio and video through a switched network such as a Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN) which includes transfer of information across the Internet. In managing the above system, a user profile information is stored, and the user information includes name, address, fax number, IP address and e-mail address as disclosed in column 27.

Furthermore, the Krishnaswamy et al. reference discloses “X. INTERNET TELEPHONY AND RELATED SERVICES” in columns 74 through 113. The communication in the Internet telephony includes connections between 1) PC to PC, 2) PC to PSTN, 3) PSTN to PC and 4) PSTN to PSTN. To manage these communication transactions, the user profile method is created based upon the information that is gathered from individual users as disclosed in column 108. The information includes name, address, e-mail address and IP addresses that have been already generated before and stored elsewhere. The user must input the above information.

The Examiner has stated in Paragraph 2 of the currently pending Office Action that the Krishnaswamy et al. reference allegedly discloses in column 108 “a new user profile method being created.” Based upon the above allegation, the Examiner has concluded that a new user profile “serves the function of a new address definition being generated.” As described above, the Krishnaswamy et al. reference merely discloses “a user profile” or the “registration information [being] gathered from the user.” But no new address definition is “automatically” generated “based upon the corresponding predetermined rule definition” as called for by each of the newly amended independent claims.

In relation to billing of these communication as disclosed in “XXI, BILLING” in columns 267 through 282, the Krishnaswamy et al. reference discloses “Network Call Identifiers” (NCID) for identifying each of the communication transactions. As illustrated in the flow charts in FIGURES 92, 93 and 94A, a NCID is generated. As described with respect to FIGURE 94A in column 279, the step 3114 of FIGURE 92 generates a NCID to reference a particular call. Each NCID includes a sequence number and a time value for an associated port. Thus, the NCIDs will be used to reference a particular call for the purpose of billing. Although the NCID is generated on the fly, the NCID is not associated to “the address definition” Again, no new address is generated, and no suggestion is provided for the new address definition in the Krishnaswamy et al. reference.

With respect to the two portions of the alleged disclosure on a newly generated address by the Examiner in the Office Action, the Krishnaswamy et al. reference still fails to anticipate the above quoted patentable features of the current invention as explicitly recited in each of the independent claims. The two alleged disclosures are at lines 52 through 60 in column 183 and lines 1 through 10 in column 184. The first portion is related to “list management.” A distribution list is created by the “subscriber” who is “prompted for recipient names and addresses.” (lines 52-53). Although the “subscriber is able to manage his distribution lists with create, review, delete, edit (add and delete recipients) and rename capabilities,” no address is “automatically” generated according to a predetermined rule “to generate a new address” as required by each of the newly amended independent claims.

Furthermore, the disclosure at lines 1 through 10 in column 184 is related to the manual modification of the subscriber lists. This portion of the disclosure merely adds that the modification to a list is cascaded to other relevant lists that contain the modified information via “a global change.” (lines 2 through 6).

The Examiner has stated that the Krishnaswamy et al. reference allegedly discloses in column 183 “a list [that] is defined based upon the type of list being created.” Based upon this allegation, the Examiner concluded that the “defined list serves the function of a rule definition.” Again, no new address is “automatically” generated “based upon the corresponding predetermined rule definition,” which is provided “to generate a new address” as called for by the newly amended independent claims. Thus, the alleged disclosures in the Krishnaswamy et al. reference clearly fail to anticipate the patentable features of the newly amended independent claims.

For the above reasons, the Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 12, 21 and 22 are not anticipated by the cited reference. In addition, dependent claims 3, 4, 10, 11, 14, 15 and 20 ultimately depend from independent claims 1, 12, 21 or 22 and incorporate the above discussed patentable feature of the independent claims. Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 1, 3, 4, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15 and 20 through 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) should be withdrawn.

#### The Section 103 Rejections

The Examiner has rejected dependent claims 2, 5 through 9, 13 and 16 through 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103 in combination of the Krishnaswamy et al. reference, the Taylor et al. reference and the Ouchi reference.

As discussed above with respect to the section 102 rejections, the Krishnaswamy et al. reference fails to disclose or teach the “automatic” generation of a new address “based upon the corresponding predetermined rule definition,” which is provided “to generate a new address.” It appears that the Krishnaswamy et al. reference also fails to suggest the same patentable feature.

The Ouchi reference generally discloses a message-based workflow systems and methods for computer networks. By use of the e-mail based system, the Ouchi reference exemplifies a workflow of submitting, approving and reimbursing business expenses for predetermined projects. For each project, a predetermined set of e-mail addresses is assigned to perform the above exemplary tasks. For example, the approval task is performed by a predetermined singular manager or one of pre-assigned managers depending upon the employee who submits the request. In any case, the e-mail addresses are stored in advance for various employees, tasks and projects, and the predetermined rules or conditions simply determine to retrieve one of the previously stored e-mail addresses. In other words, the retrieved address is not “automatically” generated, but simply retrieved.

The Taylor et al. reference discloses an integrated system for electronic mail, facsimile transmission, terminal emulation and file synchronization among distributed computers. An electronic address book allows information to be efficiently sent to users of both electronic mail and facsimile transmission. To optimize the communication, five types of address cards are implemented to include a person card, a group card, a computer card, a calling card and a service card. For example, the person type address cards hold personal and destination information about a specific person or entity. Similarly, the group type address cards hold group/personal and destination information about a specific person or group. The personal/group and destination information further include a list of “electronic mail addresses” as well as phone and fax numbers. The only existing mail addresses are stored, and no new mail addresses are “automatically” generated.

As discussed above with respect to the section 102 rejections, independent claims 1, 21 and 22 each explicitly recite “automatically generating a new address definition based upon the corresponding rule definition at the second device....” Similarly, independent claim 12 also explicitly recites “said second device ... automatically

generating a new address definition based upon the corresponding rule definition ....” In other words, a new address is automatically generated according to a rule rather than being placed by a user.


Since dependent claims 2, 5 through 9, 13 and 16 through 19 ultimately depend from independent claims 1, 12, 21 or 22 and incorporate the above discussed patentable feature of the independent claims, a combination of the cited references must disclose, teach or suggest the patentable features of the independent claims.

In sharp contrast, any combination of the Krishnaswamy et al. reference, the Taylor et al. reference and the Ouchi reference fails to teach, disclose or suggest the “automatic” generation of a new address “based upon the corresponding predetermined rule definition.” Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit to the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claims 2, 5 through 9, 13 and 16 through 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103 should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the above remarks and attachments, the Applicants respectfully submits that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request a favorable Office Action so indicating.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Ken I. Yoshida, Esq.  
Reg. No. 37,009

Date: May 25, 2006

KNOBLE YOSHIDA & DUNLEAVY LLC  
Eight Penn Center, Suite 1350  
1628 John F. Kennedy Blvd.  
Philadelphia, PA 19103  
(215) 599-0600